The RECONSTRUCTIONIST

VOL. XIV. MARCH 19, 1948 2 ADAR 8, 5708 No. 3

- ***ON RELIGION AND THEOLOGY***
  by Will Herberg
- ***PASTORAL CLINICAL TRAINING IN OPERATION***
  By Israel J. Gerber
- ***WAR TIME OBSERVATIONS OF A JEWISH CHAPLAIN—(Review)***
  by Edward T. Sandrow

Dedicated to the advancement of Judaism as a religious civilization, to the upbuilding of Israel's ancient homeland, and to the furtherance of universal freedom, justice and peace.

the Reconstructionist

is published bi-weekly for twenty consecutive issues, starting in October, by the Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation, Inc., 15 West 86th Street, New York 24, N. Y. Subscription $3.00 per year; 15¢ per copy; foreign 25¢ extra; membership in the Foundationn, $5.00 per year, including subscription to *The Reconstructionist*. Reentered as second class matter October 3, 1935, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

EDITORIAL BOARD:
Chairman: **Mordecai M. Kaplan**
Associate Chairman: **Ira Eisenstein**
Managing Editor: **Eugene Kohn**

Associate Editors: **Israel S. Chipkin, Judith K. Eisenstein, Theodore Friedman, Roland B. Gittelsohn, Jacob S. Golub, Emanuel Green, Bernard Heller, Will Herberg, Aharon Kessler, Immanuel Lewy, Edward T. Sandrow, Leo Shapiro, Milton Steinberg, Bernard Weinryb, Max Wiener.**

Contributing Editors: **Morris Adler, Michael Alper, Nathan A. Barack, Morton M. Berman, Philip S. Bernstein, Asher Block, Samuel M. Blumenfied, Ben-Zion Bokser, William J. Boxerman, Jack J. Cohen, Mortimer J. Cohen, Lawrence W. Crohn, Samuel Dinin, Harry Essrig, Emanuel Gamoran, Judah I. Goldin, Solomon Goldman, Robert Gordis, Samuel C. Kohs, Milton Konvitz, Myer S. Kripke, Louis M. Levitsky, Theodore N. Lewis, Joshua Loth Liebman, Sidney Morgenbesser, Maurice Pekarsky, David Polish, Joshua Trachtenberg, Leo Trepp. Max Weine, Jacob J. Weinstein.**

Executive Secretary: **Hannah L. Goldberg**

AMONG OUR CONTRIBUTORS

ISRAEL J. GERBER is rabbi of Congregation Agudath Achim, Fitchburg, Mass.

Saturday evening at 8:30 O'clock
March 27, 1948
15 West 86th Street,
New York City

PANEL DISCUSSION

JEWISH RELIGION IN THE MODERN WORLD

PANELISTS:
WILL HERBERG
MORDECAI M. KAPLAN
IRVING J. KRISTOL

The Public is Welcome!

THE FUTURE OF THE AMERICAN JEW

By MORDECAI M. KAPLAN

"A master work of religious thought in our age. . . . I feel that multitudes of searching souls, Jewish and Christian alike, will find a pathway to a new faith in this brilliant book." . . .

Joshua L. Liebman, author of *Peace of Mind.*

THE FIRST EDITION OF THIS BOOK IS LIMITED.

ORDER NOW!

$6.00 per copy

JEWISH RECONSTRUCTIONIST FOUNDATION, Inc.,
15 West 86th Street, New York 24, N. Y.

Please send me ..... copies of THE FUTURE OF THE AMERICAN JEW.

Check for ..... is enclosed.

Name .....

Address .....

The RECONSTRUCTIONIST

Vol. XIV March 19, 1948 2 Adar 8, 5708 No. 3

EDITORIALS

NO WORLD WAR THREE!

EVENTS in Czechoslovakia have sent a tremor of fear throughout the Western world. Yet that event was itself born of fear, of the Russian fear of Western imperialism. That fear may be groundless. So also may be the fear of Communist world domination through Soviet-backed revolution. The tragic truth is that all such fear tends to bring about the very situation that it envisages, until what were once imaginary dangers become real ones. Suspicion leads to breaking off of necessary negotiations; the breaking off of negotiations leads to competitive armament; competitive armament leads to the conviction that the other side intends aggression; this conviction sooner or later leads one side to try to forestall the aggression of the other side by itself initiating aggression. Thus the cold war leads directly to the hot war.

How can this vicious circle be broken? It can be broken only by a great act of faith, an act of faith like that which Franklin D. Roosevelt called for and called forth in solving America's internal crisis. "We have nothing to fear but fear itself"—that was the slogan that proved effective. It can prove no less effective in world affairs.

We must call off the war of nerves. Nothing is gained by international name-calling. The world stands in dread of the explosive power of the atom. But the atom cannot explode unless human nerves explode first. It is with them that the chain reaction starts. They set off the fuse without which the atomic bomb is as harmless as a toy pistol. If there is no peace in the world today, all nations have had some share in creating those conditions that result in conflict. To try to fix the blame on this or on that group of foreign powers is a convenient rationalization to absolve ourselves of our share of responsibility for maintaining the peace of the world.

We must clear the slate and try a new start. Let us forget the past for a while and concentrate on the present need. In spite of our different traditions and ideologies we are all human beings. We have some common obligations towards our common race, our civilization and the coming generations. Whatever philosophy we may believe in, there is no philosophy which strives for the suicide of the human race. On the contrary, all different philosophies of life are concerned about an integration of mankind. Democracy and Marxism, liberalism and biblical religion have one goal in common: the humanization of mankind, the security, education and dignity of everybody, the libera-

tion of the many from the role of a privileged few.

But what of our ideological differences: Can communism and free enterprise live in the same world? Can imperialism be reconciled with national freedom? Can capitalism and socialism tolerate one another?

Ideological conflicts prevail also within nations. It would be absurd to contend that there are no clashes of interest within the United States, within the British Empire, within the Soviet Union. But those conflicts do not issue in warfare, because they are submitted to law and governmental regulation. What is good for the multi-racial United States, the multi-national Soviet Union and the multi-continental British Empire, should hold good for the United Nations. Peace should be attainable by and on behalf of the two billion inhabitants of the globe, now that the democratic principle that government must be in the interest and with the consent of the people, has been, at least constitutionally, accepted over virtually the whole world.

We dare not despair of human reason and its capacity to build up an international authority and a regime of international law competent to abolish war. It is tragic that not only worldly cynics, but morally earnest and devout religious leaders have helped to spread that despair. Some theologians tell us that man is by his very nature, selfish, greedy, pugnacious and avid of power. Since nations consist of human beings, these theologians conclude there is no hope for peace except as each human soul, by an act of divine grace, is made fully to accept the gospel of love.

This view stresses too much the negative side of man's nature. Men are not wholly given to destructive impulses. They are also, as we assume in our daily affairs, sensible, cooperative, friendly, freedom-loving and creative. If we really have faith in God, let us see in these positive and constructive elements of human nature a manifestation of Him, and let us build upon them.

What can we do now to stop the drift to war?

First, we should eliminate as far as possible all war thoughts and war talk. No magazine, no newspaper, no book, no course of studies, no radio, no film, no private talk should represent war as inevitable. It would be well if the very word "war" were for a time taboo.

Second, we must strike the imagination of the masses to envisage the possibility of peace and the opportunities for achieving it. Let us fix a date on which every pulpit, every school, every magazine, every radio, every newsreel will deal with one subject—the positive steps to prevent war—will deal with it without blaming any power, without hate, slander or self-righteousness. All the ministers, all the educators, all the lawyers, all the doctors, all the men of letters, the mothers, the youth, the businessmen, the workers, all the cultural organizations in all cities and in the country should be urged to cooperate. Prize contests might be organized, dramatizations performed, flags displayed. The occasion should be made a popular holiday, not one monopolized by the routine politicians. If other nations can also be induced to adopt it, so much the better.

Third, to prevent such a mass-inspiration from becoming an opiate, we must translate the mass of good-will into legal and institutional acts. We must make the United Nations a United Mankind. Knowing that war is the absence of law, we must create a Law of Humanity and exalt it above national laws, the sovereignty of Man, above national sovereignties. Our educational institutions

from kindergarten to university should inculcate this doctrine: Let us not die but live for one another. Let us settle our conflicts in a spirit of reverence for life. Let us humanize the struggle for power by strengthening weak nations, not by keeping them down. Let us capitalize all the diverse approaches and contributions of the different peoples to the humanization of mankind, and thereby effect that humanization, and the achievement of universal peace.

IS OUR GOVERNMENT BACK-TRACKING ON ITS PALESTINE POLICY?

SENATOR Warren Austin was very much put out several days ago when Andrei Gromyko accused the United States of attempting to re-open the entire Palestine issue. The American delegate said: "We shall judge the issue when the consultations are completed."

Unfortunately, on the basis of certain acts of our State Department, Mr. Gromyko was quite justified in coming to the conclusion that we were backing down on our attitude in favor of the partition plan. Since November 29th, the United States government has shown a singular incapacity to create an independent foreign policy with regard to Palestine. The American policy has been functioning as a tail to the kite of the British diplomacy.

The British position has been clear from the start; British spokesmen have consistently opposed partition or any form of a viable Jewish state in Palestine. At this writing, they are adamant in their refusal to cooperate with the UN in the implementation of the decision. They persist in disarming Jews, and hampering all efforts at Jewish self-defense. They are not yet participating in the discussions carried on by the Big Five, designed to arrive at a more peaceful solution of the problem. They have announced that, although they are determined to leave the country by May 15th, they are not prepared to guarantee that Tel Aviv or any other port will be "unfrozen" even after May 15th. Meanwhile, the British expect the Jewish Agency to move out all the Cyprus detainees by August 1st.

In spite of verbal professions to the contrary, the actions of our State Department indicate an ominous parallel to that of Great Britain. The arms embargo, placed by our government against the shipment of all arms to Palestine, has already been shown to be a help to the Arabs and a menace to the Jews. No distinction is made between the defenders of the UN decision—and of their lives—and the aggressors; both, in theory, are equally denied access to arms. In reality, even this theoretic neutrality is contradicted by the actions of our government. When the Arabs ordered landing boats from this country, the boats were allowed to sail, on the ground that they had been demilitarized, although, as a matter of fact, they were equipped for easy remilitarization. On the other hand, steel plate, which might have been used for making armored cars as a protection against attack, was refused export license.

Two thousand cases of kosher beef, destined for Tel Aviv, were not allowed out of the country a few days ago. Officials are quoted as saying that "by some strange oversight by officialdom somewhere along the line, no meat quota at all has been granted for Palestine, and therefore the approval of export licenses for the shipment of kosher meat has been rejected." This in spite of the report that, when the Mandate ends on May 15th, there will be a food crisis in Palestine.

Does the American government want the Jews in Palestine shot down? Does

the American government want them to starve? Is the American government intent on playing Great Britain's game, without regard for considerations of humanity and honor? Certainly, these tactics do not fit in with the professed eagerness of the administration to carry through the partition plan.

The only charitable interpretation one can give to the obvious contradictions between American policy as expounded by our delegation in the United Nations and American policy as exemplified in some of the acts of our State Department is that one hand does not know what the other is doing. Incompetence, at this point, would be easier to take than outright betrayal. If, indeed, our representatives at Lake Success are working at cross purposes with the State Department, they should make it quite clear to the President that their own hands must be upheld, that no group of individuals has the right to establish a private foreign policy.

If Senator Austin was annoyed with Mr. Gromyko for suggesting that the United States was backing down, he should not have scolded Mr. Gromyko. He should have demanded of the State Department that it cease embarrassing him by sabotaging a policy to which our country is committed.

THE BOGIE OF A "JEWISH ENCLAVE"

UNDER the title, "Our Duty as Americans—Our Responsibility as Jews," the American Jewish Committee has recently published the Presidential Address of the Hon. Joseph M. Proskauer at the 41st Annual Meeting of the Committee. The address is in many ways an admirable statement of the position of the Committee on issues confronting the Jewish people at the present time. There is no possibility of mistaking the moral earnestness of the speaker, his deep sense of responsibility for world Jewry. Though not a Zionist, he pleads most earnestly for the implementation by UN of the Assembly's decision in favor of a Jewish state in a part of Palestine. He also appeals for the implementation of the report of President Truman's Committee on Civil Rights not only as it affects the Jews but as it affects all who are subject to "discrimination either by law or by human conduct in every area of American life."

With one passage of his address, however, we are in emphatic disagreement. We refer to that part of it which explains the reasons for the American Jewish Committee's withdrawal from the American Jewish Conference.

"We hear a great deal of discussion," he says, "about Jewish unity. And . . . we are met every now and then by movements to secure that unity through organization, by majority vote, by some form of institution that will be what was recently described as 'a spokesman for American Jewry.' . . . Unity is not uniformity. . . . Clear thinking would lead us inevitably to the conclusion that fantastic attempts to hold Jewish elections in America, as though Jews were a corporate body that would vote in large numbers, are foredoomed to failure. . . . There could be no greater perversion of the true spirit of democracy than such an endeavor to override the free expression of opinion in non-political areas. Those who attempt to force such uniformity against the will of national organizations such as ours . . . are not securing Jewish unity —they are adding to the picture dissensions and dispute. There are, and there ought to be as of right, differences of opinion among us. . . . There is — and there can be — no spokesman for American Jewry. There is—and there can be—

no Jewish enclave within the confines of America. More than that—there must not be any appearance of such an enclave."

We are not deeply interested in the future of the American Jewish Conference. As we have stated on more than one occasion, we feel that authority in Jewish communal life cannot begin with the national organization of Jewry but must begin with local communal organizations which can subsequently unite in a national federation. But we are interested in the arguments of Judge Proskauer, because they reveal a dangerous confusion of mind on the subject of democracy in communal life. If that confusion is not resolved, the prospect of any kind of effective Jewish community is doomed to frustration.

It is hard to disentangle the bewildering skein of Mr. Proskauer's reasoning in order to point out its incongruities and its unreality. But the line seems to be something like this:

Jews have differences of opinion. Where there are differences of opinion (at least on non-political matters), one opinion is as good as another. Since the opinion of the majority is not necessarily more correct than that of the minority, it is "undemocratic" to put the minority at a disadvantage by applying the principle of majority rule. And since all communal organization, even when democratically elected, can proceed to action only by voting and submitting to the decision of the majority, we may not have any Jewish communal organization. Indeed, we must even avoid seeming to have one.

To deny Jews the right to organize for advancing common interests because such an organization would, in order to act, have to overrule the objections of a minority is, on the face of it, so absurd that it is surprising to find a man of Judge Proskauer's logical acumen resorting to that argument. By the same logic, the American Jewish Committee would also have no right to exist. Minorities have their rights, to be sure. They have the right to express their opinions and to try to influence the thinking of the majority. They have, moreover, the right to dissent in practice from the majority where there is no need for collective action. But they have no right to veto action that the majority deems necessary for its own welfare, nor to secede from a community organization while continuing to speak as members of that community.

But solicitude for the rights of the minority is not what really moves JudgeProskauer and the American Jewish Committee to oppose a form of community organization for articulating the will of American Jewry and serving as its spokesman. He does not want Jews to act as though they were a "corporate body," because he does not want them to become a "corporate body." And he does not want them to become a corporate body because he does not want them to give the appearance of being an "enclave" in American life. He should realize that American Jewry could never actually become such an enclave in a democratic America, for Jews neither could nor would segregate themselves from the political, economic and cultural life of America. But he seems not yet to have completely shaken off the fear of Jews' being regarded as alien if they give free expression to their common interests by seeking that corporate status which the freedom of speech, freedom of religion and freedom of assembly entitle them to seek.

But unless Jews achieve communal status in America all American Judaism is doomed. Jewish religion is meaningless except as the collective quest of the Jewish people for meaning and value to their life as individuals and as a community. In his own personal life, in his courageous public stand on many issues, Judge Pros-

kauer gives evidence of his own devotion to some of these common interests of Jews. But if they are legitimate why are not all other collective expressions of Jewish life? And if all these separate aspects of Jewish life are legitimate Jewish interests, if it is right for Jews to organize to establish synagogues, schools, fraternal organizations, civic defense organizations, Jewish philanthropies, etc., how can it be wrong for them to try to unify and coordinate these efforts, to bring them into effective relationship with one another through some form of corporate communal life? Having taken so many steps toward the assertion of a positive attitude to Jewish life, we hope that Judge Proskauer will finally be forced by the logic of the faith that underlies his own activities in behalf of his people, to divest himself of the remnants of assimilationist ideology. The fear of becoming a "Jewish enclave" is a fantastic bogie conjured up by a sense of insecurity. It is time that men of Judge Proskauer's stature exorcise that fear and have the courage and candor to assert the right of Jews to organize and act collectively for the advancement of all the legitimate interests that they have in common.

REALITIES AND VALUES

IN RESPONSE TO AN EMERgency call at the launching of the United Jewish Appeal, $35,000,000 were contributed to what the UJA appropriately calls its "destiny campaign." Realizing that on the promptness as well as on the generosity of American Jewry's answer to the challenge by Arab aggression depends not only the security of the 700,000 Jews of Eretz Yisrael but the destiny of world Jewry, American Jews contributed that sum in cash "to hold the defense line in Palestine and to keep the United Jewish Appeal reconstruction program in Europe and the United States going on a restricted basis."

It took less than two weeks to raise that sum. We agree with Henry Morgenthau, Jr., the national chairman of the campaign, that this represents a "magnificent demonstration of statesmanship and maturity." And we are cheered by his prediction that contributions to meet the emergency developments in Eretz Yisrael will reach the $50,000,000 mark within another week.

▼

IN VIEW OF THE BITTER FIGHTing between Arabs and Jews in Eretz Yisrael at the present time, a doubt may have insinuated itself into many minds whether there is any possibility, even if the invading armies from other Arab states were withdrawn or overwhelmed, of ever establishing that economic collaboration between the Arab and Jewish states which is envisaged in the partition plan.

Doubters should be reassured by the following telegram sent by Mustafa el Abdallah and Bishara el Issa, leaders of the Palestine Labor League, representing 5,000 Arab workers, to a special Palestine conference of AFL and CIO unions recently held in Detroit:

"Abba Hushi, who returned last week, brought us further encouragement in your name. On behalf of pioneers of cooperation between Arab and Jewish workers organized in Palestine Labor League, we express deepfelt gratitude to Detroit workers for readiness to stand by us in our difficult sacred task. With help of lovers of peace and freedom throughout the world and with fraternal assistance of American workers, we hope to be able to establish in our independent states a free

workers' society based on cooperation of Arab and Jewish workers."

▼

CHARACTERISTIC OF ERETZ Yisrael Jewry is its boldness, not only in action, which is demonstrated in all the news dispatches from there in the American press, but to an equal degree in thought and planning.

The world was astounded by the establishment in the Negev desert of agricultural settlements. Now the Yishuv feels that these settlements need urban settlements to provide various services and to serve as a market for their produce. So it has been decided to establish one or more towns in that region.

One plan calls for an inland township of about 5,000 to 8,000 inhabitants. But that is too modest a project for some of the planners who have come forward with a suggestion for a coastal city of some 50,000 inhabitants, offering port facilities for the development of the Negev.

Were it not for what the Yishuv has already achieved, we would consider these suggestions pipe-dreams, but, as it is, we expect to see them realized within the next decade or two.

▼

SIGNIFICANT FOR THE RECONstruction of Jewish life is the encouragement of the arts. We, therefore, are highly gratified by what is being done by the National Jewish Music Council and by the Esco Fund to encourage Jewish Music composition. Jewish music month, beginning on *Shabbat Shirah,* was the occasion for two significant awards for musical composition.

Jacques Berlinski of Paris, France, won first prize, ($1,000) and Jacob Avshalamoff of New York second prize ($500) in the contest of the National Jewish Music Council, which is sponsored by the Jewish Welfare Board. Alberto Homsi of Alexandria, Egypt, won honorable mention.

Herbert Brün of Tel Aviv won the scholarship for study this summer at the Berkshire Music Center which the Esco Fund awards to the winner in a contest open to all Eretz Yisrael composers.

Music has always been a medium of expression for Jewish feeling, but it is only in recent years that composition of Jewish music has come into its own. During the ghetto period, Jewish isolation kept Jews out of the main stream of the world's musical development. In the early post-Emancipation period, Jewish music tended to follow too closely European musical patterns. Today new Jewish music is being composed with a full mastery of all the modern musical techniques, and also with the inspiration of the renascence of Jewish peoplehood and Jewish civilization.

▼

AFTER THE SURFEIT OF SWEET sentimentalities to which we are treated from the pulpit annually during Brotherhood Week, it is good to read in the *Religious News Service* of March 1st, the following suggestion of an alternative to Brotherhood Week, which comes from Rabbi Samuel Price of Springfield, Mass.

"It would be much better," he said in the course of a Brotherhood Week program, "to have the one week in fifty-two, dedicated to hate, a week when we would all be able to get the hate out of our systems, treat one another as badly as we know how, and then observe the remaining fifty-one weeks as Brotherhood Weeks."

▼

A PROPOS OF RABBI GERBER'S interesting articles in the last two issues of our magazine, two items culled from recent releases of *Religious News Service* are worth noticing.

1. Duke University Divinity School has

(*Contiued on Page* 13)

On Religion and Theology

Some Comments on Max Wiener's Article

By WILL HERBERG

MAX Wiener's discussion of the relation between religion and theology,* seems to me one of the most impressive treatments of the subject that I have recently come across. That the religious experience is essentially ineffable and yet—because it occurs in man, the "verbalizing animal"—presses for rational expression, is the profound though paradoxical truth which he takes as his point of departure. And his conclusion—

> "If we cannot remain silent, but must speak, we should never forget that every word or doctrine, dogma, symbol or article of faith is nothing but a human attempt to state in rational terms what, according to its very essence, is hidden from us"—

is surely a powerful reminder that our very best conception of God is after all no more than our own *particular* conception and is therefore bound to be infected with the relativity and error of our particularity. The most difficult thing, apparently, for man to realize is that, even when he is thinking high thoughts about God, he is thinking his own thoughts, not God's. Dr. Wiener understands this very well and says it very effectively. His analysis is especially cogent because it refuses to succumb to the glib superficialities of rationalism and takes its stand squarely *within* the religious consciousness.

Nevertheless, I find some serious objections to the way Dr. Wiener develops his argument and to some of the conclusions to which he is led. My objections, it is true, do not touch his central point; yet they seem to me to be of importance and so I will present them here with some of their implications.

Dr. Wiener's General Line of Argument

The author's general line of argument runs somewhat as follows: The religious experience is immediate and ineffable, yet men "cannot remain silent but must speak" and so they formulate their theologies and religious systsms. These theologies and systems, however, must be recognized for what they are. They are not the absolute truth; "rather are they the inherited methods by which a historic community symbolizes the unknowable." Once we realize this, we will not refuse to "acknowledge various religious systems as the adequate expression of the reactions of members of particular groups to their experience of the holy."

This argument seems to me to imply, first, that the religious experience is essentially one and the same for all individuals, cultures and communities, and secondly, that religious systems and theologies are all nothing more than historically conditioned forms of expressing this common experience and therefore ultimately all equally valid—since validity in this case can mean nothing more than adequacy of embodiment in terms of the historical culture. Take as an analogy a scientific insight like the law of gravitation. It is essentially one and the same for all but it is expressed differently in different languages. In some language, the expression may be clumsier, less lucid, etc., than in others; yet clearly all expressions are ultimately equally valid: no one can say that

* "Religion and Theology," *The Reconstructionist*, December 26, 1947.

the law of gravitation in one language is "truer" than in another. It would be absurd to insist that the English version is "more valid" than the German or Chinese; it is just better for those bred to an English culture. The same holds for theologies: each is a particular, historically conditioned way of expressing the religious experience; one theology is no "truer" than another, it is merely better for those bred to that specific culture.

This cultural relativism seems to me to be wrong on two grounds. In the first place, I do not find all religious experience to be the same, and secondly, even for the same religious experience, I do not believe that all theological expressions are on a par.

Objection: All Religious Experience Is Not the Same

Dr. Wiener offers no argument to prove that the religious experience—the experience revealed in the religious consciousness—is one and the same for all; he simply assumes it. But I do not think that the evidence will sustain him. Is it seriously suggested that the religious experience, the *immediate* experience, of the primitive idol-worshiper and the Hebrew prophet, of the Hindu self-annihilating mystic and the Jewish or Christian saint striving for blessedness in God's service to fellowman, of the devotee of one or another of the democratic religions of our time and the worshiper of the transcendent God beside whom there is none other—is it seriously suggested that the religious experience in all these cases is the *same*? Of course, all religious experience possesses certain notes or marks, as Rudolf Otto has so strikingly shown; but that is altogether different from saying that the experience itself is identical for all.

But if the religious experience is not one and the same, if there are *different kinds* of religious experience to start with, it can no longer be contended that religious systems and theologies differ only as the different cultural expressions of the same experience. It must be admitted that they may differ in at least two distinct ways: as different expressions of the *same* religious experience and as the respective reflections of *different types* of experience. The conception becomes much more complicated, it is true, but for that very reason, it approaches closer to reality.

It should be noted that the variant types of religious consciousness cannot be exhaustively explained in terms of cultural conditioning. They transcend the relativities of history and can be adequately treated only in terms of the autonomous categories of the religious experience. An illuminating analogy, as Otto and others have stressed, is the esthetic experience. This possesses certain marks that give it its unique character, yet obviously it is not one and the same in all cases. There are various kinds of esthetic experience, and while psychology, culture-history and other disciplines may throw a great deal of valuable light on the subject, the esthetic experience in its manifold varieties is ultimately to be dealt with only in terms of the specific categories of esthetics.

Objection: Not All Theologies Are on a Par

This analogy may lead us to my second point of criticism of Dr. Wiener's thesis. Even the same type of esthetic experience—which basically is also ineffable—may come to be expressed in different esthetic systems or philosophies. And these different esthetic philosophies are not simply different cultural expressions of the same insight; they do not all say the same thing in different "languages." They—or at least some of them—actually say *dif-*

ferent things even when the initial experience is the same; they are essentially different interpretations of that initial experience. And this difference of interpretation too cannot be exhaustively accounted for in terms of cultural conditioning; specifically esthetic categories must be introduced.

More broadly speaking, consider the case of philosophy in general. Philosophers all try to interpret the same reality and yet they produce different philosophies. Are we therefore to say that differences in philosophic system are simply differences in cultural form, culturally different ways of saying the same thing, so that no distinction in relative validity can be made among philosophies? Of course not; cultural factors may operate, but we must recognize that, in at least some cases, philosophers are trying to say different things about the same reality and that some views are in some sense more acceptable than others.

Just so in religion. The same type of religious experience may be interpreted in different ways and these different interpretations embodied in different theologies. Variant theologies are, of course, embedded in their cultural contexts but they transcend those contexts; only the specific categories of theology can do justice to them. The autonomy of the religious cannot be denied.

Implications of This Criticism

What are the implications of my criticism? In the first place, if there are different types of religious experience, then it is conceivable that some may be "better" or "higher" than others. This does not seem to me a very startling conclusion. Who would care to deny that the religious *experience* of an Isaiah was in some sense "higher" than that of the idol-worshiper of his time? The real problem arises when we come to specify in *what* sense, to formulate the criteria of judgment and evaluation. But that is a problem for the philosophy of religion; however adequately or inadequately it may be dealt with, the fact itself cannot be denied.

Moreover, since different interpretations of the same religious experience may differ in something more than mere cultural garb, it may no longer be asserted that all theologies are necessarily equally valid or equally adequate expressions of even the same religious experience, any more than that all esthetic philosophies are equally valid or equally adequate accounts of the same esthetic insight. One theology *may* be truer or more valid than another. Again the problem is to formulate the crtieria, but again the possibility itself cannot be ruled out.

I do not know to what degree Dr. Wiener himself really denies the possibility that one theology may in some sense be truer than another; I do not know, in other words, how thoroughgoing is his cultural relativism as applied to theology. He emphatically, and very properly, denies that any theology can claim to be *absolutely* true, can make pretensions to "an *infallible* knowledge of the divine." But denying that any theology can be *absolutely* true is not equivalent to denying that there may be various degrees of truth in theology, that one theology may be *relatively more true*—in the specific meaning of truth for theology—than another. I do not find a categorical denial of the latter possibility in Dr. Wiener's article, although some of his radically relativist formulations might be interpreted in that sense.

I am particularly perplexed about certain expressions occurring in Dr. Wiener's article because of their ambiguity and possible implications. He writes: "We have to distinguish strictly between theological systems . . . and authentic religio-

sity . . .," and again: "[We must] distinguish between the pure experience of the divine and the theological philosophy in which the intellect interprets that experience." The crucial words here are "authentic" and "pure." Is it implied that *all* religious experience is *equally* "pure" and "authentic"—in which case, what is the point of the adjective except to indicate immediacy? Or is some religious experience *more* "pure" and "authentic" than others? An unequivocal answer to this question would be a great help.

Problem of Theological Method

If my contentions are at all sound, the primary task becomes the development of a theological method, operating with its own proper categories and capable of formulating the criteria of religious exerience and theological interpretation. Some very interesting work along these lines has recently been done in this country. I would refer particularly to the articles, "The Problem of Theological Method," by E. A. Burtt and Paul Tillich in the January, 1947, issue of *The Journal of Religion* and to Paul Weiss's piece, "Philosophy and Faith," in the same journal for October, 1946. It is along such lines—avoiding the pitfalls of a corrosive relativism and a dogmatic absolutism alike —that theological thinking, it semes to me, should proceed.

These remarks, I hope, will not obscure my essential agreement with Dr. Wiener's main thesis. It is vitally important to distinguish between the religious experience and the theological system in which that experience is interpreted. And it is even more important to remember that "every word or doctrine, symbol or article of faith is nothing but a human attempt to state in rational terms" an experience that is ultimately beyond reason and words. One attempt, I believe, may be more valid or adequate than another, but the difference is, in the final analysis, inescapably relative; no system is simply identical with "*the* truth." Our idea of God, no matter how magnificent, is not God Himself, and it is the self-idolatry of presumption to pretend it is. Humility and a keen sense of the limitations of creatureliness are perhaps more essential to theology than to any other enterprise of the human spirit.

REALITIES AND VALUES

(*Continued from Page* 9)

announced the establishment of a Department of Pastoral Care to be headed by the Rev. Russell L. Dicks, chaplain of the Wesley Memorial Hospital in Chicago.

2. The Nichols Veterans Administration Hospital at Louisville, Ky., has a Religious Advisory Board. The Board, the only one of its kind, was organized by Chaplain Frank O. Taafel. It consists of lay members of Protestant, Catholic and Jewish congregations who visit the patients in the hospital, each denomination being assigned a month for making visits. Though the visits are purely social, any religious need voiced by the patients is met.

These two items underscore two recommendations of Rabbi Gerber: (1) that training in pastoral care be part of preparation for the rabbinate, and (2) that Jewish communities have rabbi-chaplains to provide for the religious needs of Jewish hospital patients.

Pastoral Clinical Training in Operation

By ISRAEL J. GERBER

This is the second of two articles describing the author's experiences and observations as a student of the Institute of Pastoral Care at the Massachusetts General Hospital. The first article, "A Rabbi 'in White,'" described the course and the author's reaction to it. The present article discusses clinical cases under the author's pastoral care, as an illustration of the kind of service it is possible for rabbis to render to their "parishioners" if adequately trained for such tasks.

EDITORS

DURING my six weeks of training at the Institute of Pastoral Care at the Massachusetts General Hospital, I could sense a decided change in my counseling technique as well as in my attitude. And truthfully, I was rather elated at this transformation. As one day followed another, I said to myself: "I am becoming a better equipped spiritual leader. How much more helpful I shall be to my community when I return." Why did I feel this change? This could best be illustrated by describing actual personal situations with which I dealt this past summer at the hospital as a chaplain-in-training.

For two weeks before we began calling on patients, we were apprised of some of the methods that had proven most successful in becoming acquainted with patients, and some of the more helpful ways of responding to them under certain circumstances. We all learned at the Institute of Pastoral Care, however, that no amount of instruction could take the place of actual contact with the patients themselves.

Letting the Patient Talk

The first visit that I made at the hospital was to an unmarried woman of about fifty years of age, who was compelled by her illness to lie flat on her back. This woman had undergone a very delicate operation two days before. When I came into her room and the introductions had been made, I noticed she was writhing in pain, continually grabbing at the traction on her bed. I thought it best to leave because of her condition. However, as I was about to tell her that I would come back at another time, she started telling me about her operation, the length of her illness, and her familial tensions. All that I did during the next fifteen minutes, was to listen and to make a remark now and then.

Here was decided verification of what we had previously been told by our lecturers—that a patient is helped by merely speaking as freely as possible. I had almost missed this first-hand opportunity. In writing up my call, I noted that, as our conversation progressed, her suffering seemed to diminish. The Rev. Mr. Wiesbauer, the reader of my papers for that week, wrote in the margin at that point, "I wonder how this happened?" It seemed to me that some of her pain flowed out of her body with the outflow of her words which, in turn, helped release emotional tension.

What pleased me at this interview was that she did the talking, she "carried the ball," not I. Before my training with the Institute of Pastoral Care, I feel I would have become technical, would have asked unnecessary questions about her family, would have criticized her attitude, would have brought in some of my own personal experiences, or those of someone else. I did not do that now. Rather was she the center of attention; her feelings were of primary interest; she was the

object of consideration, no one else. It was on that level that our interview took place.

This was another object lesson substantiated by actual contact. No matter how consoling I would have been, no matter how forcefully and persuasively I would have told her that her antagonisms and jealousies were groundless and baseless, I would not have been able to give her the release and the comfort that she got, if I had not used my clinical training. Whereas I would have been directive, I now followed the path of non-direction. For unless she gained her own insights, neither I nor any other counselor would have been of help to her. This holds true in all cases. The individual involved must accept whatever solution is arrived at. In fact, it is best if he suggests the course of action.

This woman was in real need of help for she was beset with a number of problems: family disagreements, a jealousy of members of her family (their health, perhaps), a strong attachment to her nephew, feelings of discrimination on the part of non-Jews, and her antagonism towards non-Jewish girls who marry Jewish men (while she is single) and yet mouth anti-Semitic utterances. It was mainly due to the pastoral clinical training I had acquired that I helped her gain some insights into the above problems. What truly made me feel good was when she herself said to me, explaining her antagonistic feelings: "You know how it is. When you are on your back continuously, you like to pick on everybody." Yes, she had come a long way. She obviously understood herself better, much better than if I had preached to her.

Among the insights I believe she gained was a new understanding of the status of her religiosity. During one of my visits with her, she remarked that she did not regard herself as religious because she does not perform as many religious acts as her mother did, such as continually reading the Bible. After further discussion, the realization dawned on her that religion consists of much more than just reading Scripture, and that she, by her own admission, was practising other aspects of religion which her parents apparently neglected. This insight led her to declare: "I guess I'm more religious than I thought."

In this respect, I found that this woman was not an isolated case. Two other patients uttered similar statements. And, believe me, they were happier people after they understood somewhat their religious status. I decided that many of my parishioners were likewise in need of such insights. I resolved to continue with this type of counseling in my community, for, I feel, it will possibly help to resolve guilt-feelings.

There are two other pastoral opportunities that I would like to mention in this article. One concerns an unmarried man of about sixty, while the second one involves a married man of about forty.

Relief of Loneliness

My unmarried friend (for we did become friends) had an eye condition and during the two weeks that I visited him, he did not see me once. His eyes were constantly bandaged. When I learned of his marital status, I felt it would help me to understand him better if I knew why he remained a bachelor. Whereas, under ordinary circumstances, I would have popped the question regarding his celibacy during the first visit, I did not, however, learn the reason until the middle of the second week, and then because he wanted to tell me himself, not because I was inquisitive. If I had asked him directly, he might have felt that I was probing too much by asking such a personal question. Furthermore, he had to

feel that I was a friend, interested in him, and this feeling could not be attained at the first or even at the second visit. Probing is poor pastoral technique. It hinders rather than helps.

This patient was a lonely man, in more than one sense of the term. He had no family, except for two sisters who live in distant parts of the country, and since he came from outside of Boston himself, even his few friends visited him infrequently. Loneliness and isolation were very real problems to him, especially with his eyesight taken away, thereby making it impossible for him to read, to look at pictures, or to see other patients.

He cried twice during my contacts with him—during the first and the last time I saw him. At the initial meeting, he was so overcome with the unexpectedness of my call that he cried so much that he could not speak, which was evidenced by the quivering of his lips. He was truly overwhelmed. When I placed my hand on his shoulder and his crying subsided, he said haltingly: "It is very nice and considerate of you to visit me." This same scene was repeated when I told him that I was returning to my own community and doubted whether I would see him again at the hospital. His words then were almost identical with the ones already quoted, but said with greater warmth.

I was deeply touched by this, and I said to myself, "How many lonely and isolated people there are in my community whom I have neglected to visit. How they must yearn for company, for someone with whom to talk, and I have not given them even a little of my time." But I then reflected that my rabbinical training did not include pastoral calling. Am I to be held responsible for neglecting a task for which I was not trained? I then consoled myself that it was *"bishgagah"* (not deliberate) both on my part and the Seminary's. Neither of us was conscious of this need. But I was impressed by the emotional catharsis the patient apparently experienced.

My pastoral training was extremely helpful in this instance. I believe some guilt cropped up in the patient's mind because he was a member of the Workmen's Circle which has, more or less, divorced itself from religion. He was also in a state of anxiety because he was to undergo a second eye operation, which gave him some feelings of insecurity. He thought I was going to be antagonistic because of his affiliation, which I might have been, but clinical training instructed us not to be judgmental. This coincides with our rabbinical teaching which advises us to speak to the patient tactfully. He did say to me: "You must be judging me, Rabbi," to which I replied, "I have not come to judge you." It was then that he uttered, what was to me, a very meaningful statement: "Rabbi Gerber, I look upon you as a friend who comes to visit me. You are interested in me and I want to tell you about my thoughts." Accepting him as he was meant more to him than anything else.

I even went further and gave him the opportunity to explain the Workmen's Circle to me, thereby giving him status, instead of rejecting him because of his background. I gave him the opportunity "to teach the rabbi," thereby dispelling any thoughts that I was antagonistic towards him. He felt he was contributing to my store of knowledge, which was a big boost to him. He was happy and so was I, for I was fulfilling the precept of our sages by doing something beneficial for the patient.

I feel that the Institute of Pastoral Care is entitled to great praise in this particular case. Were it not for the pastoral clinical training that it sponsored, I believe this man would have remained

lonely and isolated while at the hospital. Because I was there, thanks to the Institute of Pastoral Care, this man's loneliness was eased. Also, he bore concrete testimony to the necessity of visiting in hospitals, when he said: "As I told you, Rabbi, every visitor makes the patient feel that much better."

In one of the early lectures at the hospital, the speaker said that people's problems are seldom strictly theological. The problem in the foreground is that of adjustment, with the understanding of God a part of it. This was brought home to me vividly in the last case that I shall discuss, that of the married man of some forty years of age, mentioned above.

Illness Complicated by Business and Family Worries

When I met him, he was awaiting an operation the following morning, and he admitted to me that he was afraid of the outcome. He did not expect to see the light of day again, once he went under the anesthetic. He backed up this belief by drawing up a will before entering the hospital. The reason he gave me was that his doctor had told him it was a serious operation, the second one for the same ailment.

If this had been told me six months ago, I would have accepted it as the sole reason without further thought. I stayed with him, however, and gradually more of the story began to emerge. He was concerned about his business, which he feared might fail while he was in the hospital. All his years of toil would go to the grave with him, and his wife would be the sufferer. He had no one on whom to rely, for his two older sons, who were managing the business, were irresponsible, he said. He felt this way about them because they had married non-Jewish girls, which upset both his wife and himself. He also felt that his sons had married girls beneath their station. Both girls, he said, had neither "character, looks, nor upbringing." In fact, the mother of one of them is regarded by some people as a "loose woman." He felt that if his sons could act this way in their private lives, they must be equally irresponsible in the business world. Furthermore, he felt his sons were lost if he died. Then, instead of bringing their wives up to their level, they would be "dragged down" to the level of their wives." They simply could not get along without him.

Here was indeed an immature attitude on the part of the parent. He had to live his sons' lives for them. He had little faith in them. He wanted both their marriages to end in divorce. If he left the hospital alive, he said that he would take the necessary measures. It was apparent that, in addition to his fears and family situation, he was harassed with an ambivalence.

So you see, what beset this man was not really the outcome of the operation, but many other problems. His expressed fear of death was due to a number of reasons other than the physical factor. He felt that he was a failure as a parent so far, because of his sons' actions, and was hoping that he would not die in order to get the chance to rectify his former inadequacy. He was, therefore, planning to take a firm hand in his sons' lives if, and when he should leave the hospital. He was further concerned, as he later said, about his own parents' atttiude to their grandchildren's assimilation. He was afraid of its having an unfavorable effect upon his parents and was therefore resolved to see that his sons' marriages terminate in divorce, although the girls had embraced the Jewish faith before marriage.

As the days went on, things worked out well in his business. His sons did work acceptable to him in his stores,

and he felt that they were not the irresponsible people he originally had felt them to be. He learned that they could get along by themselves, and that he did not need to run their lives for them. His daughters-in-law visited him at the hospital and he was visibly impressed. He gained sufficient insight to realize that the marriages were accomplished facts. Consequently, he will strive to make this situation a wholesome one, although he personally feels that inter-marriage should not take place.

One morning, as I walked into his room, he began discussing religious practice with me. He told me of certain things he did, which, normally, one would not care to tell others, especially a rabbi. I did not display any shock or disappointment at what he told me, but accepted whatever he had to offer. When he felt that I was accepting whatever he had to say in good faith, he continued to go further into his feelings. It was then that I was able to lead him into some insights which he did not possess before in regard to the meaning of religion and its practices. Instead of flaring up and castigating him for his irreligiousness, I believe I helped him by responding to his feelings, thereby leading him along wholesome paths of thinking and feeling which helped him see the same facts in a different light.

One feature that was very noticeable in him was his inconsistency in his religious outlook, which I believe is quite prevalent among many Jewish people. On one occasion he said to me that he considered himself Orthodox, but that his daughters attended the Sunday School of the Reform Temple. Although he does not practise Orthodoxy, he said, "It is nearer my heart." Yet, when it came to converting his daughters-in-law to Judaism, he called a Reform rabbi to effect the conversion and to perform the marriage ceremony, because, as he said: "Rabbi Y (the Orthodox rabbi) was too technical." That is, the patient was an adherent of Orthodoxy as long as it was convenient. When Orthodoxy confronted him with its demands, however, he was on the other side of the so-called "fence." This is indicative of the confusion that exists in the minds of many of our people. I could not help thinking of my parishioners back home, as well as those of many of my colleagues.

There is one other aspect of this case that gave me considerable satisfaction. On four different occasions, the first thing we spoke about upon meeting was the amount of pain which he experienced between the hours of six and seven every evening and which continued until about eight in the morning. I had a theory of my own as to the reason for his suffering, especially when he told me that eighteen x-rays had been taken and the doctors could find no organic reason for his pains.

On the fourth occasion, I casually asked him when his business place closed for the day, and he said at about six in the evening. I then remarked, "Isn't it peculiar that your pains begin at six o'clock, the same hour as your store is closed?" I said no more, but he stared at me for a moment, and a tiny smile curled up on his lips.

The Preventive Value of Rabbinic Counseling

The pastoral training at the hospital helped me glean some new perceptions of which I had previously been unaware. The exercise in interpretation, in establishing connections, has since proven extremely helpful to me as well as to many other people.

While at the Massachusetts General Hospital, I learned from my own observations, that almost every patient has some sort of worry that is causing him

concern. There is, however, nothing "abnormal" about it. Furthermore, people want to discuss their anxieties with someone. There was one woman that I visited, who came from an Asiatic country. She, to my mind, was the most well-adjusted of all the people I called on at the hospital. Yet, she, too, had her problem. She was dispossessed while she was a patient.

This is true of everyday life, too. Almost every human being has one or more problems bothering him. This is a normal situation. But the important consideration is not the number of problems we have, but what we do with them, how we deal with them. A trained and skilled rabbi is, therefore, a valuable asset to any community in preventing minor problems from becoming major eruptions. In fact, the burden of responsibility rests upon the rabbinate, for we are serving the people. It is vitally important that we become aware of it.

Book Notes

WAR TIME OBSERVATIONS OF A JEWISH CHAPLAIN

WITH AN H ON MY DOG TAG, by Morris N. Kertzer; illustrated by Laszlo Matulay. Behrman House, Inc., New York, 1947. 197 *pp.* $2.75.

OUTSIDE of the routine military and naval exploits of World War II and the examples of strategy on the part of generals and admirals, little has come out of the war about the personal agonies and spiritual *"wehmuth"* of the average service man. Ernie Pyle, Bill Maudlin and Willard Waller have contributed to the socio-historical literature of those crucial war years. No one has written a clear, incisive analysis of the problems of an American soldier who is a product of a minority culture—a soldier who really fights two wars, one, for the victory of the land of his citizenship, the other for the survival of his people and his faith. "With an H on My Dog Tag" by Rabbi Morris N. Kertzer is not quite such a book. It is, however, a valuable journal by a sincere, hard-working chaplain who documented his own experiences with details of the European war. It is chock-full of rich and valuable anecdotes relating to the remnant of European Jewry in the days following the invasion of Normandy to V-E Day. It is a social study revealing local religious custom and color in obscure villages of Western Europe. It is full of pathos and humor, alive, instructive and intimately written.

Rabbi Kertzer's accounts of war-time Italian Jewry and his objective appraisal of the apostasy of psycho-neurotic Zolli are fare for the modern Jewish historian. His appeal for spiritual succor and educational assistance from America for Italian Jewry should long ago have become part of American Israel's "Marshall Plan." It is the same sort of call to missionary zeal another former chaplain, David Rubin, made for the Jews of Iran and Iraq when he returned from those backward Arab lands in 1945. Too bad that in the hectic turmoil of Jewish fund raising and organizational overabundance we fail to insure the spiritual survival of large chunks of our people.

"With an H on My Dog Tag" introduces the American Jewish combat sol-

dier to us, and also the Underground Jewish soldier who in the war years, at the risk of everything in the world, was bent on bringing his people out of the miasma of a Nazi-infested Europe to Eretz Yisrael. The book offers ample proof of the psychotic, sadistic and subhuman machinations of the German military mind. Lastly, Rabbi Kertzer gives a post-facto analysis of what might have been (1) had America opened her doors to unfortunate prisoners of Nazi concentration camps, (2) had Britain opened the doors of Palestine, (3) had the Church in Germany (and the rest of the world) spoken out fearlessly against the shame of anti-Semitism. All of Rabbi Kertzer's experiences, his peregrinations through the air, the mud, the dusty roads, the seas linking America, Europe, Africa and Asia, his marching with his men through war and blood and horror lead him to one conclusion: Israel must be reestablished in its ancient homeland. This simply-and warmly written book of the war experiences of a chaplain is empirical proof of the necessity of the November 29th, 1947, decision of the United Nations.

EDWARD T. SANDROW

BOOKS RECEIVED

IN MY FATHER'S PASTURES, by Soma Morgenstern, translated from the German by Ludwig Lewisohn. This is a sequel to *The Son of the Lost Son,* and is an idyllic narrative of Jewish rural life in Polish Galicia between the two world wars. 369 pp. Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1947. $3.00

TRUMPET IN ADVERSITY AND OTHER POEMS, by Louis I. Newman. A collection of poems deriving their inspiration mainly from Jewish experience past and present. xviii + 206 pp. The Renascence Press, New York, 1948. $2.50.

NETAFIM (Hebrew poems), by Anne S. Kleiman. Contains 40 moving lyrics by a native American Jewess. Attractive pamphlet format. 41 pp. College of Jewish Studies, Chicago, 1947.

JOLLY JINGLES for the Jewish Child, verses by Ben Aronin, pictures by Lili Cassel. Attractive to the child in form and content, 58 pp. Behrman House, 1947. $2.00.

EL HAYELADIM BETEMAN (Journey to Yemen), by Aron Meged. A story for children in simple Hebrew, attractively illustrated. This is the first of a series designed to provide entertaining reading in Hebrew for children in Jewish schools. 91 pp. The United Synagogue Commission on Jewish Education. New York, 1948. $1.25.

THE PRICE OF LIBERTY, a History of the American Jewish Committee, by Nathan Schachner. Gives a complete record of that organization's activities in defending Jewish rights and combating anti-Semitism. 225 pp. with Index. The American Jewish Committee, 1948. $3.50.

INTERCULTURAL ATTITUDES IN THE MAKING, edited by William Heard Kilpatrick and William Van Til, the ninth yearbook of the John Dewey Society. Contains an introductory chapter by Dr. Kilpatrick on "Basic Principles in Intercultural Education," and eight additional chapters by eminent educators, grouped about three themes: "Working with Young Children," "Working with Young Adolescents," and "Working with Youth." ix + 246 pp. Harper and Brothers, New York and London, 1947. $3.00.

RELIGION IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY, edited by Vergilius Ferm. Contains a preface by the editor and thirty-seven chapters, each describing the religious viewpoint of some religious denomination or movement by an eminent authority. In addition to Christian and Jewish religious outlooks, various chapters of the book deal with Hinduism, Buddhism, Taoism, Confucianism, Shintoism, Islam, and other faiths. Judaism is represented by three chapters: Reform Judaism, by Louis I. Newman; Conservative Judaism, by Simon Greenberg; and Reconstructionism, by Mordecai M. Kaplan. xv + 470 pp. with Index. Published by the Philosophical Library, New York, 1948. $5.00.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL, by A. Roy Eckardt. Aims to afford a Christian basis for a liberal attitude toward Jews and Judaism in harmony with Neo-Reformation Protestant thought. xvi + 223 pp. with Bibliography and Index. King's Crown Press, New York, 1948. $3.00.

Random Thoughts

Horse sense is generally no better than what it claims to be.

* * *

The Sage in Proverbs says:

"A man's own folly ruins affairs, then he blames God for it."

The Poet in the *Odyssey* has Zeus say:

"How vainly mortal men do blame the gods! Of us, they say, comes evil; through the blindness of their hearts they bring sorrow on themselves."

* * *

Spirituality is not merely a volatile form of moral goodness.

* * *

If husband and wife were less eager to make each other over to please themselves, and more eager to make themselves over to please each other, the divorce meter would come down a good deal.

* * *

The rabbi was about to begin the wedding ceremony, when he noticed a man with a camera prowling nearby.

"Don't take any pictures," the rabbi warned the man sternly.

"Why not?" replied the photographer, "my job here is to take snapshots of wedding ceremonies. The only ones to object are the Catholics. Why do you insist on acting like the Goyim?"

* * *

Sunday Schools, from the Orthodox and Conservative point of view are a delusion, educationally, but a potent snare to catch members with.

* * *

The separation of state and church is about as successful a compromise as would be the separation of stomach and heart.

* * *

The opiates, by which men try to overcome sickness or failure, generate dreamwords that poison their sanity and dignity.

* * *

The doldrums are said to be parts of the ocean near the equator, where the calm that prevails is the origin of the devastating hurricanes.

No wonder the world today is in the doldrums.

* * *

Directing and acting are said to "make" the play.

Similarly, effective and relevant interpretation "makes" tradition.

* * *

Few are the human hearts through which passes the middle road between intransigence and appeasement.

* * *

Power without plan or policy is as constructive as a dumpheap of TNT.

* * *

Our Government has developed the manufacture of good intentions into a large-scale industry.

The most recent one is its "intention" to support the Palestine Partition Plan.

It looks as though Hell's roads are being paved for heavy war traffic.

* * *

The loyalty which a people elicits is due far less to the glories of its past than to those of its expected future.

* * *

When occasion arises for you to swallow your ego don't swallow it whole. You are liable to choke on it.

Be sure to dissolve it first in the milk of human kindness.

* * *

Mankind would have been much better

off if more of its spiritual leaders had belonged to the vertebrate type.

* * *

The foremost problem in Jewish religion is how to get Jews to take the Bible seriously without taking it literally.

* * *

St. Augustine taught that in order to understand we must believe.

The Rabbis taught that in order to understand we must do.

Which means that the Rabbis were better psychologists than St. Augustine.

* * *

Responsibility is not a ball and chain but an anchor.

* * *

Accuracy of vision is of little use without the proper point of view.

* * *

Why would it be so much easier to live and function as a Jew in an organic Jewish community than within the confines of an individual congregation?

Because it is easier to swim in the ocean than in a bathtub.

* * *

The portrait painter or sculptor who spurns simple realism, and prefers to exploit his subject for the purpose of displaying his own fantasy should be required to append to his work of art the usual caveat: Any resemblance to an actual person is purely coincidental.

* * *

To feel that we are wanted augments our vanity.

To feel that we are needed increases our self-respect.

* * *

Many a Conservative Jew becomes a Reform Jew at the drop of a hat.

* * *

"Atheism, that is to say, deepest doubt," according to the noted Protestant theologian Paul Tillich, "induces in religion a radical tension and thus preserves it from stagnation."

According to the late Chief Rabbi Isaac Kook of Jerusalem, "Atheism does to conventional religion what an electric storm does to the air. It purifies and freshens it."

* * *

To try to explain to the average American Jew the process of living in two civilizations is like trying to explain that the earth is round to a man who says that it has always been flat where he has been living.

* * *

Despite what people say when they pray, most of them believe in the god named "Everybody."

All they have to be told is that "Everybody" does it. That settles all questionings and puts an end to all argument.

It takes the courage of a Prometheus to assert one's will against "Everybody."

* * *

What is normative in an earlier age becomes descriptive in a later age.

* * *

By taking people for granted because they happen to be harmless, we are responsible for the mischief they cause when they want to attract attention.

* * *

We question the historical claim of *Torah min ha-shamayim* (the Torah as coming from Heaven), but we cannot question the ethical duty of *Torah l'shem shamayim* (Torah for the sake of Heaven).

* * *

If religion were more generally recognized as a realm of inarticulate groping instead of being regarded as a realm of

articulate griping, we might have made more headway in it.

* * *

Thoughtlessness can be as cruel as heartlessness.

* * *

Some new evil always follows a new good, even as weeds follow the plow that breaks up the soil.

* * *

The pleasant, the profitable and the prudent are the three peas in the pod of selfishness.

* * *

Free enterprise, which is free of all social responsibility, tends to grow to a point where its predatory propensities overshoot the mark.

That is very much like what we are told about the saber-toothed tiger.

Its long canine teeth kept on growing until they became so long that the tiger could not bite effectively, and it became extinct.

M. M. K.

Correspondence

No Domination of American Jewish Education by the World Union

Sirs:

Since you published in your columns critical comment on the resolutions of the World Conference on Jewish Education, your readers will doubtless be interested in an official interpretation of the force of those resolutions.

In order to clear up the question whether the World Union for Jewish Education intended that the resolutions passed at its Jerusalem conference be binding or not upon Jewish educators in the Diaspora, the following action was taken:

(a) The American Organization Committee of the World Union voted unanimously that "every organization and institution that accepts the principle underlying the aims of the World Union for Jewish Education, i.e., that Jewish education should be 'Zionist and Hebraic in the spirit of the Torah and of the classic Jewish tradition,' and seeks to express these aims within the general framework of its activities, can join in the World Union for Jewish Education, the understanding being that the right is naturally given to all members of the Union to interpret these aims in the spirit of their own outlook."

(b) Inquiry was then made from the Central Committee in Jerusalem as to whether this understanding is correct, and a reply was received "unanimously to approve the resolution of the American Organization Committee as being in the spirit of the Jerusalem conference."

(c) At a recent meeting of the American Organization Committee, it was further stated, that, in interpreting the World Union to various American organizations, it is understood that the term "Zionist and Hebraic in the spirit of Torah and the classic Jewish tradition" be given wide interpretation and that organizations and institutions which are not "Zionist" officially may join, if only within their program there be included specific educational work on behalf of the upbulding of Palestine as the Homeland.

The publication of this information should be very helpful in removing the misunderstanding which has arisen and which has created considerable obstacles in our work.

ALEXANDER M. DUSHKIN
Executive Vice-President,
Jewish Education Committee of New York

On the Needs of South American Jewry

Sirs:

With the greatest of interest I have read the article by Rabbi Lemle, which was published in your edition of June 13th, 1947 (Vol. XIII, No. 9). Without going into particulars, I believe that his observations may be taken as

valid for practically all communities in South America. I very much appreciate his initiative and take this opportunity to add some observations of my own from the point of view of Jewry in Chile.

There have been Jewish communities on this continent for some decades but the great Jewish institutions on the North American continent have taken notice of them only in the last few years. The enormous needs of world Jewry, together with the destruction of most centers of Jewish charity, has caused the national institutions of the Jewish people to recognize our continent too. I have been working with the Chilean Jewish communities for about 8 years and hardly a day has passed during that time on which one, two or even more *shelihim* were not to be found residing here, most of them in the fashionable hotels of the town. The great Jewish institutions seem not yet to have realized that these communities, which until yesterday were without any connection with the Jewish world in general, cannot be regarded simply as milch-cows, but must be helped to form their Jewish life anew. The work done in the communities proceeds without plan or purpose. The people who lead them have, without doubt, often the best intentions of working for the welfare of the Jewish community, but many of them have not had the necessary education to create an organized cultural Jewish life. Practically everything is lacking, especially trained men who are able to see the problems in their right dimensions and proportions.

We do not have enough rabbis, teachers, etc., who have had the education to qualify them for solving the problems of today. It is evident that, in view of this situation, the voice of religious and cultural Judaism is to be heard only very faintly. The sole connection many Jews have with Judaism is a sort of feeling for Zionism, which finds its only expression in those sums of money given for Jewish and especially Zionist causes. The older generation still keeps up a sentimental remembrance of the "old home," which the younger naturally does not. In these South American countries—for the time being at any rate—it is very easy to lose all connection with the Jewish people. The generally tolerant atmosphere—at least as far as Chile is concerned—helps all those who want to assimilate to do so.

Since *assimilation* implies a definite intention, it would perhaps be better to describe the attitude of these Jews as *imitation*. To give an especially clear example—until a few years ago it was almost unheard of in this country for Jews from Poland and Russia to close down their shops and offices on Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur, because many of them were afraid of provoking anti-Semitism. Only the example of recent Jewish immigrants from Central Europe has recently led a few to express their solidarity with the Jewish people by closing their enterprises on those days. Generally speaking, this new immigration has had a very good influence on Jewish life here. The necessity of a Jewish education is more and more acknowledged by the leading circles. (We say nothing, of course, of what they think a Jewish education should be like.) The two Jewish public schools and one college in Santiago are attended altogether by about 450 children. When one considers that the Jewish population of Santiago amounts to about 25,000 souls and the number of children of school age to about 3,000, this means that only 15 percent are receiving a full Jewish education. There are also afternoon classes for *Ivrit* and Jewish history, which are attended only by the children of Orthodox circles and of immigrants from Central Europe.

These conditions demand a thorough reorganization and federation of South American Jewry. To achieve this, we need the help of North American Jewry.

What is to be done?

1. The Jewish communities of South America must be reorganized and a working connection established among them.

2. Our contact with Eretz Yisrael must be strengthened; Jewish communities here must realize that the Yishuv needs their help not only in the form of monetary contribution but to help them live as Jews in the Diaspora.

3. The great North American institutions must assume a responsibility also for the relatively young communities down here.

4. Besides the *shelihim* who come to us to raise money, we need—as Rabbi Lemle has already stated—others who can help us to build up a cultural, religious and Zionistically inclined Jewry. We have a number of young people who are willing and able to do Jewish work and who must be given the opportunity to acquire the knowledge and experience which they can obtain only from North American and Palestinian sources.

E. Loewenstein, *Rabbi*
Santiago de Chile